

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &  
STEINER LLP, fka THELEN REID &  
PRIEST LLP,

No C 06-2071 VRW

Plaintiff and  
Counterdefendant,

ORDER

v

FRANÇOIS MARLAND,

Defendant and  
Counterclaimant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &  
STEINER LLP, fka THELEN REID &  
PRIEST LLP,

Counter-  
Counterclaimant,

v

FRANÇOIS MARLAND, SUSANNAH MAAS &  
PHILIPPE BRUNSWICK

Counter-  
Counterdefendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_

1 The court granted summary judgment for law firm  
2 plaintiff, counterdefendant and counter-counterclaimant Thelen Reid  
3 Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP ("Thelen") on August 1, 2007. Doc  
4 #320. Thelen filed a timely bill of costs seeking reimbursement of  
5 \$64,070.02 from defendant, counter-claimant and counter-  
6 counterdefendant Francois Marland ("Marland"). Doc #322. Marland  
7 has not filed an objection to Thelen's bill of costs. The time for  
8 objecting has passed. Civ LR 54-2(a).

9 Counter-counterdefendant Philippe Brunswick ("Brunswick")  
10 filed a timely bill of costs seeking reimbursement of \$898.80 in  
11 transcript costs from Thelen. Doc #328. Thelen filed a timely  
12 objection. Doc #332. Thelen argues that Brunswick is not entitled  
13 to costs because he is not a "prevailing party" as required by FRCP  
14 54. The court agrees. "A party in whose favor judgment is  
15 rendered is generally the prevailing party for purposes of Rule  
16 54(d)." d'Hedouville v Pioneer Hotel Co, 552 F2d 886, 896 (9th Cir  
17 1977). Here, judgment was entered in favor of Thelen on August 3,  
18 2007. Doc #321.

19 Accordingly, Brunswick's request for costs is DENIED.  
20 The clerk is DIRECTED to tax Thelen's bill of costs in the amount  
21 of \$64,070.02.  
22

23 SO ORDERED.  
24



25  
26 VAUGHN R WALKER  
27 United States District Chief Judge  
28